

APPENDIX D STAKEHOLDER TASK FORCE MEETING DOCUMENTS

Meeting	Date	Page
Meeting 1	January 31, 2011	D-3
Meeting 2	April 18, 2011	D-11
Meeting 3	June 29, 2011	D-29
Meeting 4	September 7, 2011	D-39
Meeting 5	November 15, 2011	D-49
Meeting 6	February 6, 2012	D-57

[This page has been left blank intentionally]



**Los Angeles County Flood Control District
Sediment Management Strategic Plan
Task Force Meeting # 1
January 31, 2011**



LA County Department of Public Works Headquarters Building
900 South Fremont Avenue. Alhambra, CA 91803

Goal

Manage sediment in order to provide for the flood protection and water conservation needs of the region while balancing environmental, social, and economic impacts.

Agenda

Welcome

Sediment Management Needs and Current Methods

Sediment Management Strategic Plan

- What are the challenges we are trying to address?
- What opportunities are there?

Task Force Purpose and Structure

- What is your role?

Potential Solutions

- Transport
- Reuse
- Placement
- Other

Considerations, Constraints, and Challenges

Next Steps

If you have any questions or concerns please contact:
Dan Sharp at (626) 458-4345 or dsharp@dpw.lacounty.gov



**Sediment Management Strategic Plan
Task Force Meeting # 1
January 31, 2011 2:00-4:00 pm**



Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Headquarters
900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803
Conference Rooms A & B

Meeting Summary

Note: For reference purposes, the meeting agenda, Task Force invitation list, and Task Force Meeting # 1 list of attendees are attached. For a copy of the presentation please email Marcela Benavides at mbenavides@dpw.lacounty.gov.

Welcome

Gary Hildebrand, Division Head of the Watershed Management Division of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, welcomed and thanked the attendees. He indicated sediment management is necessary in order to provide for the flood protection and water conservation needs of the region. He explained that the goal of the Task Force is to find sediment management solutions that balance environmental, social, and economic impacts. Gary also introduced the Sediment Management Strategic Plan Project Team: Lani Alfonso, Dan Sharp, Marcela Benavides, and Laura Rockett.

Presentation

Dan Sharp gave a presentation that provided background information about the Los Angeles County Flood Control District. He also talked about the Sediment Management Strategic Plan, the purpose and structure of the Task Force, and potential sediment transport, sediment reuse, sediment placement, and other alternatives.

Alternatives Brainstorming Session

After the presentation, the attendees broke up into six (6) groups to brainstorm about additional alternatives. Below is a compiled list of the notes from the breakout groups.

Transportation Alternatives

- If the system is more natural there may not be any need for transportation
- Truck sediment, deal with dust issues, investigate hybrid/alternative fuel/more environmentally friendly trucks to subsidize cost and reduce environmental impacts
- Sluice, sluice during flooding, investigate alternative sluicing methods
- Slurry pipeline, other pipelines
- Rail, railroad-type tracks embedded into flood control channels with flat transport cars
- Conveyors, conveyors that generate power

Re-use Alternatives

- Beach replenishment, beach rehabilitation, restoration of coastal wetlands
- Use to fill/rehabilitate gravel pits
- Inert landfill cover, alternative daily cover at landfills

- Rip rap, channel armoring, gabions
- Agricultural industry – topsoil, land replenishment
- Landscaping industry – turf replacement, nurseries
- Landform grading
- Housing and development industry
- County's and other agencies' construction projects such as ports, schools, roads, and bridges as well as for filling smaller sites like the Gold Line
- Brownfield development (for cap)
- Mine for re-use, e.g., mine from behind Santa Fe Dam including stockpile
- Multi-use processing, grade and classify material
- Sell the material, have a sediment/soil broker, market the sediment, commercial reuse, commercial involvement
- Alternative uses, make glass or something with it
- Research alternative uses of sediment

Placement Alternatives

- Back to hills, back to mountains
- Offshore (explore environmental benefits), drilling mud
- Shoreline, beaches
- Build an island in the Harbor (like Japan)
- Inland desert (appropriate locations adjacent to railroad)
- Gravel pits, gravel pits in Irwindale, hillside mines
- Landfills (inert landfills), identify distance to landfills. Example: Puente Hills landfill closure → open space
- Restoration projects, restore coastal wetlands, restore SPS when filled (make more naturally landscaped – work with community/scientific community)
- Parks and Recreation use
- Transportation/grading
- “Send it to the moon” (or other places out of the County)

Other Alternatives

- Change/reconfigure/re-engineer the system, retrofit dams, deepen channels, structure upstream, gabions, regain capacity at reservoirs, improve facilities (bring up to size)
- Purchase land along the channels to make a more natural system, relocate residents in danger zone, mimic nature (bigger piles, better shape, native habitat)
- Clean out sediment before it gets too far into a debris basin or reservoir
- Conduct outreach/educate the public about alternatives
- Restore sediment placement sites after filled to make them seem more natural - work with community & scientific community
- Require use of sediment on all development projects requiring fill
- Prevention - erosion control, invasive removal so that natives can grow and prevent erosion
- Prepare downstream facilities for incoming sediment from sluicing operations – if sluicing a certain amount of sediment, remove that same amount of sediment from downstream facilities first
- Phase sediment removal
- Communication – language, modes, timing, feedback (Models of Communication: Newhall Land, Ventura Watershed Protection District, Rim of the Valley)

Other Thoughts

- All sides must be flexible
- There must be diversity and transparency in the process, transparency, results, timing/convenience
- The right people need to be involved (expertise), credibility, consult existing stakeholder groups
- Learn from the past
- Have to combine multiple ideas
- Approach should be interdisciplinary/collaborative - allow for flood protection, water conservation, and watershed health; consider biological and recreational components
- Incorporate multi-use components including passive and active recreation in sediment placement site planning and use
- Augustus F. Hawkins Natural Park built on organic and sediment landfill
- There should be internal collaboration
- Consider all feasible options, do not limit
- Cost, Consider cost issues, cost/benefit of water conservation/flood protection vs. sediment, long-term view of cost
- Determine the cost managing the sediment as it is currently done. Compare the cost of the alternatives with that cost.
- Credit system/other funding sources
- Replacement of downstream sediment for economic value
- Filling pits complicated by water at bottom of old pits
- Organic and silt problematic
- Timing – needs vs. availability
- In-house environmental review, independent oversight committee for EIRs
- Adhering to existing development rules, land-use policy
- Existing Flood Control District facilities
- Local solutions

Consideration, Constraints, and Challenges

Following the breakout session the Task Force discussed considerations, constraints, and challenges related to sediment management. The items discussed with the whole group are summarized below.

- The economic value of ecosystems, including stormwater interception, pollution filtration, carbon sequestration, recreation opportunities should be considered. Various groups have developed economic values for ecosystems. Consider using those numbers in the evaluation.
- The animals and plants that reside in the region's open space need to be considered.
- The actual people affected need to be represented better. Who is representing them? Homeowners associations do not always speak on everyone's behalf. Should consider more than the immediate neighborhood; need to consider the region. Are those who use downstream facilities being considered?
- The impact to the environment needs to be evaluated in a broader scope.
- The solutions need to be optimized. There is not going to be one solution to the problem; it is going to be a combination and optimization of many methods.
- Project goals and criteria need to be clear.
 - o How do you put a price on any one specific consideration?

- There is no one solution to the problem.
- The environment needs to be taken into consideration.
- There needs to be a transparent process. Is it possible to invite some groups to assist in the selection of the consultant to perform work for this project?
Response: The consultant has already been chosen from a list of as-needed consultants the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works has. The Consultant's work will be discussed openly with the Task Force and anything found to be unacceptable will be reconsidered. It is feasible to amend the consultant's scope, as necessary.
- Short-term projects are appearing to be a bigger deal through the presentation. If they are not currently being considered a high priority, they need to be. We need to consider the short-term projects highly now as they will be a big part of the long-term plan.
- The scope of work for the project needs to consider the long-term approach.
- Upstream effects need to be evaluated.
- An integrated approach needs to be taken.

Upcoming Clean-Out and Sediment Placement Site Projects

While the Strategic Plan is being developed, Public Works will continue to plan various needed sediment removal/placement projects. There will be a separate process to outreach to stakeholders as the plan for each specific project is developed. Task Force attendees were invited to sign-up to receive information about the following upcoming projects:

- Big Tujunga Reservoir clean-out
- Devil's Gate Reservoir clean-out
- Cogswell Reservoir clean-out
- Eaton Wash Dam clean-out
- La Tuna Sediment Placement Site
- Pacoima Reservoir clean-out
- Morris Reservoir clean-out

Any pertinent information from the work being done on the upcoming projects and the Sediment Management Strategic Plan will be shared between the groups.

Next Steps

The Task Force will reconvene in approximately 2 months.

In the meantime, Public Works will contract a consultant to complete a Sediment Management Study that will assist in the development of the Sediment Management Strategic Plan. While it is not feasible to provide the Scope of Work for the study at this time, as requested at the meeting, the scope will be provided to the Task Force as soon as possible.

The County will work with the Task Force and other stakeholders to obtain any relevant information that could be used in the development of the Strategic Plan. This includes the previously developed economic values for ecosystems mentioned during the meeting.

Contact Information

Please contact Dan Sharp or any other member of the Project Team if you have any questions, comments, or suggestions throughout the project.

- Lani Alfonso: lalfonso@dpw.lacounty.gov, (626) 458-7165
- Dan Sharp: dsharp@dpw.lacounty.gov, (626) 458-4345

- Marcela Benavides: mbenavides@dpw.lacounty.gov, (626) 458-4166
- Laura Rockett: lrockett@dpw.lacounty.gov, (626) 458-4363

SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT STRATEGIC PLAN TASK FORCE MEETING # 1 ATTENDEES

Agency/Organization	Name
Arroyo Seco Foundation	Tim Brick
Board of Supervisors Office	K. Leibrich
California Department of Fish and Game	Kelly Schmoker
California Department of Fish and Game	Sarah Rains
California Native Plant Society San Gabriel Mountains Chapter	Gabi McLean
California Regional Water Quality Control Board - Los Angeles Region	Valerie Carillo
City of Burbank	Sean Corrigan
City of Los Angeles	Fred Burnett
City of Pasadena	Dan Rix
City of San Dimas	Krishna Patel
City of San Dimas	Lisa Monreal
City of Santa Clarita	Kerry Breyer
City of Sierra Madre	Bruce Inman
City of Sierra Madre	Chris Cimino
County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health	Cindy Chen
Friends of Hahamonga	Mary Barrie
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power	Susan Avila Suarez
Main San Gabriel Basin Watermaster	Carol Williams
Pasadena Audubon	Laura Garrett
Pasadena Audubon	Mickey Long
Public and CA Native Plant Society/LA County Oak Task	Rebecca Latta
Public and CA Native Plants Society	Barbara Eistenstein
Public	Caroline Brown
Public	Tim Martinez
Public	Cam Stone
Public	Carole Seurlock
Public	Glen Owens
Public	Emily Green
Raymond Basin Management Board	Tony Zampiello
Raymond Basin Management Board	Steve Johnson
Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County	Bob Asgian
Sierra Club Angeles Chapter - Pasadena Group	Dave Czamanske
Sierra Club Angeles Chapter	Joan Licari
The San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy	Luz Torres
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Daniel P. Swenson
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Ned Araujo
U.S. Forest Service	Sonja Bergdahl
U.S. Forest Service	Lisa Northrop
United Rock Products	Dave Huss
Vulcan Materials Company	Charles St. John

Agency/Organization	Name
Vulcan Materials Company	Gary Goellner
Watershed Conservation Authority	Rob Romanek
Watershed Conservation Authority	Jane Beesly
Weston Solutions	Michael Drennan



**Los Angeles County Flood Control District
Sediment Management Strategic Plan Task Force Meeting # 2
and
Upcoming Reservoir Cleanout Projects Meeting**



**Monday, April 18, 2011
1:30 pm to 4:30 pm**

**LA County Department of Public Works Headquarters Building
900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803
Conference Rooms A&B**

Goal

Manage sediment in order to provide for the flood protection and water conservation needs of the region while balancing environmental, social, and economic impacts.

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Sediment Management Strategic Plan
Follow-up from the First Task Force Meeting
3. Listening Session
Project Development Process Feedback
4. Sediment Management Strategic Plan
Alternatives Screening Tool
5. California Department of Fish and Game
and California Regional Water Quality Control Board Permits
6. Upcoming Reservoir Cleanout Projects
Big Tujunga, Cogswell, Devil's Gate, Pacoima, Morris
7. Wrap Up



**Los Angeles County Flood Control District
Sediment Management Strategic Plan Task Force Meeting # 2
and Upcoming Reservoir Cleanout Projects Meeting**



**Monday, April 18, 2011
1:30 pm to 4:30 pm**

LA County Department of Public Works Headquarters Building
900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803
Conference Rooms A&B

Meeting Summary

Note: For reference purposes the following are included in the meeting summary:

- Meeting agenda (page 14).
- Invitation list for the meeting (page 15).
- List of attendees (page 18).

Welcome

Diego Cadena, Deputy Director over the Water Branch of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (Public Works), welcomed and thanked the attendees. He explained that this particular Task Force meeting was expanded to include additional items which are planned to enhance the Department's future engagement on both the Sediment Management Strategic Plan (Strategic Plan) and upcoming reservoir cleanout projects.

Follow-up from the First Strategic Plan Task Force Meeting

Gary Hildebrand, Division Head of the Watershed Management Division of Public Works, discussed the following items as a follow-up to the first Strategic Plan Task Force meeting, which was held on January 31, 2011.

- A summary of the last Strategic Plan Task Force meeting was provided in the invitation email to this second meeting of the Strategic Plan Task Force. Comments or concerns regarding that summary are being accepted. [Comments or concerns can be sent to SedimentMgmtPlan@dpw.lacounty.gov.]
- As requested at the previous Strategic Plan Task Force meeting, copies of the Sediment Management Study's consultant scope of work were available for pick up during this second meeting. The scope of work is also available upon request via email [Please send requests to SedimentMgmtPlan@dpw.lacounty.gov].

[As part of the Sediment Management Study, the consultant will analyze, screen, and recommend potential sediment management methods that the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (Flood Control District) may use to address the region's sediment management needs from 2012 to 2032 under the Flood Control District's jurisdiction. The Sediment Management Study is different from the environmental documentation work that will be performed for Devil's Gate Reservoir].

- The consultants performing the Sediment Management Study have begun their work. The consultants have started their reconnaissance and background information gathering and will be assisting in evaluating alternative sediment management solutions.
- During the first Strategic Plan Task Force meeting, questions were brought up regarding the Flood Control District's use of agreements with gravel pits and landfills for placing sediment. The Flood Control District is planning to use these agreements for some of the upcoming reservoir cleanout projects.
- The Flood Control District is no longer separately pursuing the development of the La Tuna Sediment Placement Site. Development of La Tuna Sediment Placement Site will now be considered as one of the alternatives to be evaluated in the development of the Strategic Plan, with the input from the Strategic Plan Task Force.
- The Strategic Plan Task Force meetings were intended to serve as a forum for agency and organizational stakeholder discussion rather than as a community meeting and so, Strategic Plan Task Force meetings have been scheduled during the work day. Many of the stakeholders in attendance are representing public agencies and are unable to attend in the evenings due to overtime budget constraints. A series of community meetings in the evenings will be additionally scheduled however Strategic Plan Task Force meetings will continue to be held during the day.
- In response to the many comments regarding the Flood Control District's coordination with the California Department of Fish and Game and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, both agencies were invited to describe their regulatory processes and to answer questions about their permits during this second meeting of the Strategic Plan Task Force.

Listening Session Summary

Roger Klemm - Public

- Sediment is a valuable resource and it is a flow that will never stop. Use it for beach replenishment and road construction.
- Flows are intermittent, need to take that into account. Take a little every year instead of performing a huge cleanout every ten years.

Dr. Clyde (Tom) Williams – Sierra Club/LA 32 Neighborhood Council

- Where are the design and operation and maintenance (O&M) manuals?
- Take exception to the comment that "estimating needs is difficult."
- Engineers are expected to solve difficult problems.

Suzanna Mast - Public

- Concerned about the La Tuna site which has 60 oaks to be removed.
- La Tuna and other sites that require taking out oaks should be removed from consideration.

March 14, 2013 10:17 AM

Lynnette Kampe – Theodore Payne Foundation

- Cost effectiveness should take into account long-term recurring costs. Cost of lost habitat should be carried into perpetuity.

Snowdy Dodson – California Native Plant Society and Theodore Payne Foundation

- Preserve the diversity of oak woodlands. Any open space or natural space is a valuable resource. Arcadia Woodland could have been used as a natural open space area. To purchase similar open space would have been millions and millions of dollars. One oak tree is worth \$30K, when combined into a woodland the overall cost is even greater.

Marianne Simon - Public

- Stood by and let the Arcadia Woodland be plowed under and did not complain. Here as a voice for the oak trees.
- Sites should not be placed on a pristine resource.
- Sediment is a resource: rich and fertile soil to be possibly used by farmers.
- Look upstream and see if we can slow the sediment moving downstream. More difficult to deal with a problem once it has rolled downstream.

Lisa Novick - Public

- Concerned about proposal to clear-cut mature oaks in La Tuna Canyon.
- Science Magazine article about 6th mass extinctions – current loss of species.
- Burned area has left seed stocks significantly decreased.
- La Tuna is the last natural area. No sediment or fill on pristine landscapes.
- Do a cost analysis on how much it would cost to take to the Vulcan Material site.

Scott Wilson – Neighborhood Church

- Read book titled “Control of Nature.” About 1/3 of the book is dedicated to FCD.
- Propose to change the name of the Flood Control District.
- Peabody Coal Mines in AZ pipe coal across state and place it in Colorado River power stations.
- Can't we have a natural approach to this?
- Can't we pipe to ocean?

Robin Robinson – Neighborhood Unitarian Church

- Believes approach should be consistent with environmental principals.
- We should have respect for the interconnected web of all beings.
- We should find alternative ways.
- Follow precautionary principle – if you are going to do harm to the environment try and find an alternative way.

Lori Paul - Public

- Interesting to have listening session before the rest of the program to comment on.
- Devil's Gate was not originally included on sign-in/interest sheet but added after the beginning of this meeting.
- The county has acquired properties back in the 50s so it is cheap to use because it is already owned. Everything is done in emergency mode.
- Emphasize that these lands are absolutely irreplaceable.
- CEQA is not up to date.

- SPS lands need to be transferred to Parks and Recreation.
- Lands have value and need to be protected.
- Represent isolated areas of habitat that once were interconnected.
- Notification of public for Arcadia was insufficient; we are in the internet age and notification should have been done over internet and should be done for any destruction of environment in the future.
- Mitigation measures are insufficient or not being done with appropriate public involvement.
- Not clear that the correct trees are being planted by Big T as mitigation.

Rody Stephenson - Public

- La Tuna Canyon should be taken off the table.
- Consider Verdugo Mountain Wilderness Area across from La Tuna – give it to the Nature Conservancy.
- Interested in Devil's Gate project. About 15 acres of mostly willows may need to be taken out. Spare as many trees as possible.
- Wants to know who the EIR contractor is and the schedule and budget, why aren't they presenting. Additionally when will scoping meeting for CEQA be held?

[Public Works is still in the process of hiring a consultant to complete the environmental documentation for the Devil's Gate reservoir cleanout project]

Julia Tarnawski – Landowner in Shadow Hills/La Tuna Canyon

- Don't ignore wildlife corridors. All kinds of creatures use these areas to travel for food and their lifestyles.
- Keep the trails open.
- Going to La Tuna will interfere with wildlife corridors.
- Leave La Tuna alone.

Laurie Walcutt - Public

- There has to be another longer-sited natural solution. Many reuses of sediment. Use the material for building materials. Maybe adobe or other building material.
- Manage the forests better to prevent fires and these kinds of debris flows.

Christle Balvin – Urban Wild Network

- Restate/reconsider mission statement for DPW.
- Areas that have been chosen are where nature grows and where there is wildlife.
- Public can understand what engineers understand – prepare good, transparent documents.

Bruce Campbell - Public

- South Central Farmers support group.
- There are other needs for sediments.
- Alleged mudflows coming from Station Fire area.
- Trees are needed for hillside stability.
- Public workers are not the problems but some of the top management responsible for destruction of wildlife should change or should hit unemployment line.
- There could be species impacts.
- Don't mess with habitat for sediment sites.

Bill Weisman - Public

- Lives immediately downhill, in the shadow, of Dunsmuir SPS.
- Likes the idea of minimal impact to environment, but not seeing it.
- Sediment is stacked up in terraces like a layer cake with complicated drainage systems and hydroseeding to prevent erosion.
- Hope the placement is seismically stable as engineers state.
- Smells diesel fumes when SPS is in operation; smell of fumes can't be mitigated.
- Required backup alarms echo through canyons; that impact can't be mitigated either.
- Haul routes rip up pavement and there have been several accidents.
- There is a proposed development near La Tuna called Canyon Hills with 200 proposed homes that already have their entitlements. The La Tuna site impacts should be added to the impacts of the proposed development to determine a cumulative impact.

Teresa Young - Public

- LA Basin has never been planned.
- Situations like natural occurrences hit us in wrong places.
- FCD has responsibility to clean out debris basins each year.
- Focus on planning with a review to the value of our land.
- Cost analysis considering the value of trees not the cost to tear them down.
- Golden Oak Borer is coming north; that will affect our oak trees.
- Asking the wrong questions. The questions should be – do we value these trees?
- Vulcan Materials asked if they can have sediment. Use the Vulcan Durbin pit. Concerned with how close it is to the 605 freeway. Sediment was said to be bad and would cause eutrophication of the water tables.

Charly Shelton – Crescenta Valley Town Council

- Defends trees and loves the sediment.
- Works for newspaper in La Crescenta area.
- Sensitive to any other losses after Station Fire and small local fire.
- Dealing with lots of sediment.
- Oaks matter a lot. Trees are a big thing to their small town. Town is made better by giant oak trees.
- Vulcan material site is an option.
- Consider monetary gain of trees at \$30K/piece and how much public support is worth.
- Meeting turnout shows that people care.
- Don't forget who you work for – we want trees kept.

Laurie Gould - Public

- Stood as symbolic guard at gate to Arcadia oaks.
- Don't want to see any more loss of oaks.

David Czamanske – Sierra Club – Pasadena Group & Urbanwild Network

- Movement of sediment
 - Sluice in pipeline or open channel to ocean is best long-term solution.
 - Coal slurry was moved 300 miles from Navajo Reservation to power plant.
- Fish and Game has a problem with sluicing.

- Push for low emission trucks – company in Japan.
- Need for technology forcing regulations – Department should put requirements in bidding process to require contracts to supply low emissions vehicles.
- Oak Woodlands Habitat Strategic Alliance has prepared an Oak Woodlands Habitat Conservation Plan for LA County – keep this document and organization in mind.
- The fact that County owns land should not be a prime consideration for what happens to that land.
- Confused by procedure - there are two divisions working on the problem. What is the relationship between these two divisions and future planning? Looking for Department to respond.
- If this Department can't solve problems to the issues will be taken to the Board and then to the courts.

Laura Garrett – Pasadena Audubon & Urban Wild Network

- Urbanwild Network is new organization born from disaster of Arcadia oaks.
- Arcadia was a horrible price to pay for a lesson.
- Thought DPW worked for the public.
- Level of arrogance was breathtaking.
 - Public was repeatedly ignored.
 - Woke us up.
- Would like a new paradigm for 21st Century
 - Transparency to public.
 - Work with nature not against it.
- Think outside box – listen to public. You can come to us for help.
- Destroying habitat is very bad. Find alternatives.

Madeline Graham – Public (read by moderator)

- There has to be a better solution than cutting down oaks.

Sediment Management Strategic Plan – Alternatives Screening Tool Presentation

Dan Sharp of Los Angeles County DPW Watershed Management Division presented on the Alternatives Screening Tool which will be used to evaluate alternatives for the Sediment Management Strategic Plan. The Alternatives Screening Tool will be developed with input from the Task Force and other stakeholders. While consideration will be taken for stakeholders concerns and opinions, the Flood Control District must meet its primary goal to manage sediment in order to provide for the flood risk management and water conservation needs of the region while balancing economic, environmental, and social concerns. The Department is proposing four evaluation factors:

Technical Feasibility Factor:

- Ability to meet needs
 - Peak demand
 - Long-term (20-year) needs
- Technical certainty
- Maintenance intensity
- Right-of-way
- Permitting complexity

- Consistency with surrounding land use

Cost Factor:

- Unit present value cost
- Initial cost & long-term operations costs
- Single number in today's dollars

Environmental Factor:

- Habitat
- Water quality
- Air quality / emissions

Social / Quality of Life Factor:

- Traffic
- Noise
- Scenic resources

This list is not final. Feedback forms were given to attendees and are being sent out to Task Force members not in attendance to comment on the proposed factors, propose additional factors and/or considerations, and also to suggest weights for each factor. The weighting of all factors will equal 100%. The Department aims to get a broad perspective on the Screening Tool and will not be taking the feedback as a vote since we retain the responsibility to carry out our mandate within a limited budget. The forms must be returned to Public Works by May 2, 2011 for consideration. Any additional comments or questions regarding the Sediment Management Strategic Plan may be submitted at any time to SedimentMgmtPlan@dpw.lacounty.gov.

Once the Screening Tool is developed, it will be used to evaluate categories of alternatives. Results will be reviewed by both Public Works staff and the Task Force. Alternatives that pass the screening process will be analyzed in more depth. Results of that analysis will be reviewed by both Public Works staff and the Task Force.

Questions and Comments on Alternative Screening Tool:

Question (Q): Please give details of contract, who, how much, timeframe, etc.

Answer (A): The consultant contract is with AECOM and Tetra Tech. The scope is for approximately \$1.3 Million and work will proceed through the submittal of their draft report in December 2011. Copies of the Sediment Management Study Scope of Work were available at this meeting and are available upon request.

Q: Is there a web page for design and O&M manuals?

A: Some of the design and O&M manuals are available online but not necessarily all of them and not necessarily on the same page. The Department can send this information out.

Q: Will this group have input to the specific factors and how they will be used?

A: Yes, we have feedback forms that ask for input on these specific factors and the weights for those factors.

Q: Which County Supervisor does the Department report to for this project?

A: The Department reports to all five supervisors.

Q: What Federal agencies have authority?

A: Many Federal agencies have authority however it depends on the project.

Comment: Consider beneficial uses of beach replenishment.

Comment noted.

[As part of the Sediment Management Study, the consultant will analyze beach replenishments as one of the beneficial reuses of sediment]

Comment: 20-years is not long term. Emphasis should be put to a sustainable, forever plan.

Response: The plan will strive to find sustainable solutions so that at the end of 20 years there won't be a need for an additional plan.

Other comments

- 20-years is not long-term. Emphasis should be put on a sustainable, forever plan.
- Encourage to state that this is a forever plan.
- Call it sustainability.
- Three environmental factors: water quantity and stability should be added for sustainability.
- Local, regional and global climate change should be added.
- Adding numerical values for a number of criteria is not good enough. There should be gateway criteria first.

Comments noted.

California Department of Fish and Game – Presentation

Helen Birss, Environmental Program Manager, and Terri Dickerson, Senior Environmental Scientist, of the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), presented a summary of the process and role of DFG generally. They indicated they were not at the meeting to speak specifically about permitting sediment management projects.

- DFG is 1 of 4 trustee agencies for the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). DFG has jurisdiction by law over natural resources.
- The roles of DFG are to comment on CEQA documents and develop Streambed Alteration Agreements.
- Sediment management projects typically require a Streambed Alteration Agreement, which falls under Section 1600 of the Fish & Game Code.
- If there is a permit process that is when DFG becomes a responsible agency.
- DFG has jurisdiction over streambed, bank, and riparian habitat.
- Although DFG does not have discretionary authority to deny a Streambed Alteration Agreement, DFG works with the project proponent to avoid and minimize impacts to resources. Any remaining impacts are addressed through compensatory mitigation.
- See www.dfg.ca.gov → resource management tab for CEQA and Streambed Alteration Program.
- DFG is the State counterpart of US Fish and Wildlife Service.

- The law requires any person, state or local governmental agency, or public utility to notify DFG of any proposed activity that will alter a river, stream, or lake.
- Based on this notification and other information, DFG then determines whether a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement is required.
- The end goal is to have an agreement in place that satisfies everybody.

Questions and Comments for Fish & Game:

Comment: Term agreement says 2 parties are in agreement.
Comment noted.

Q: If there is a violation, like in Arcadia, when you find retroactively or if there is no streambed alteration agreement – what is being done?

A: To speak on generalities, arbitration is between DFG and Public Works. The Arcadia Agreement is in compliance.

Q: Is sediment removal being considered streambed alteration?

A: Yes.

Q: Are you going to provide comment on the report of the sediment management study?

A (Dan Sharp, DPW): A copy of the study will be sent to DFG for review.

Q: What are the most recent Streambed Alteration Agreements?

A: Terri Dickerson asked the person who asked the question to see her after the meeting to discuss how she would get that information to him.

Q: If the SPS is above the riparian habitat do you have any jurisdiction?

A: Most likely not though there may be indirect impacts that could possibly be considered.

Q: If someone works in a streambed without a permit, is there any enforcement?

A: If someone works in a streambed without a permit they may be penalized. Enforcement would be by Fish & Game. The County had an agreement [for the Santa Anita Reservoir sediment removal and placement project].

Q: Was there an agreement between all agencies and the public in Arcadia?

A: The agreement is between Fish & Game and Public Works. Public involvement would happen during CEQA. Look at FAQs under CEQA online. There are some requests out to get more information about what happened in Arcadia.

Comment: I read that CEQA does not require that the public be notified. It says that the public may be notified.

Response: There is a State Clearinghouse for CEQA documents you can go to individually.

California Regional Water Quality Control Board – Los Angeles Region Presentation

LB Nye, Senior Environmental Scientist for the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board), presented on the permitting process of the Regional Board.

- Regional Board is an environmental resources agency.

- Regional Board regulates under the Clean Water Act as well as the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act.
- Protect water ways even if they are dried up or lined with concrete.
- Section 401 of the Clean Water Act says that states must certify projects such as sediment management.
- A 401 Certification typically includes conditions such as BMPs.
- Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) are developed under Porter-Cologne.
- Regional Board may choose one of two ways to permit a project. Different projects are appropriate for different approaches. A Section 401 Certification is fastest.
- A WDR (with the 401 incorporated) takes longer and has public hearings. It is better if you are trying to balance competing issues.
- Regional Board protects beneficial uses of waters of the state.
- When considering these projects, the Regional Board looks at the long-term and short-term plan. Emergencies happen and short-term is needed however long-term plans are preferred.
- Regional Board needs to know that project proponent has looked at all alternatives including project alternatives that work with the environment.
- Regional Board's approach (in order): avoid, minimize, mitigate.
- Monitoring may be required if there are impacts to water quality.

Questions and Comments for the Regional Board:

Q: What about runoff from placement of debris?

A: A permitted project would have requirements for compliance with the permit. If they are not in compliance there can be enforcement.

Q: Concerned with water recharge after the Station Fire – where is the protection for recharge aquifer zones?

A: Regional Board would only be involved with recharge at explicit recharge facilities such as spreading grounds.

Q: Did the Arcadia/Santa Anita project have a 401 Certification or a WDR?

A: Regional Board did certify where the sediment was being taken from, however there is no waterway at the location where the sediment is being taken, therefore sediment placement did not require certification.

Comment: So much decision making happens in small sections. Even when minimizing impacts, you can have something like La Tuna.

Response: One of the most important things is to look at the different alternatives.

Comment: Concerned with La Tuna not being considered individually and instead being rolled into the long-term plan. It seems like a clever way to trick the public.

Response (Gary Hildebrand, DPW): La Tuna will be going through the same screening and evaluation process as all of the other sediment management alternatives being analyzed during the development of the Sediment Management Strategic Plan. Everyone will be collectively involved throughout the process.

Post-Fire Reservoir Sediment Removal Projects

Ken Zimmer, of Los Angeles County DPW Water Resources Division, presented on the upcoming five reservoir cleanout projects: Cogswell, Pacoima, Big Tujunga, Morris, and Devil's Gate.

Approximately 160,000 acres of land were burned during the Station Fire in 2009. Another 2,000 acres were burned in the Morris Fire of 2009.

The Flood Control District has 3 major concerns when it comes to reservoirs: 1) protect the outlet valves, 2) adequate capacity for Flood and Debris Control, and 3) water conservation storage.

There are several regulating agencies depending on the project location, including the Regional Board, Fish & Game, US Army Corps of Engineers, and sometimes the US Forest Service. The timeline to begin a reservoir cleanout following a fire in a watershed can take anywhere from 2-3 years. That is 2-3 years before any sediment is removed. The following is a summary of the upcoming reservoir cleanout projects.

Devil's Gate Reservoir:

- A full Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be completed for this reservoir per the Board of Supervisors motion.
- 68% of watershed burned.
- 10 times more sediment has been deposited than has accumulated in the past 16 years.
- Some valves are currently inoperable.
- Sediment has risen 23 feet at the face of the dam.
- Scoping meetings will be the most important time for public input and participation is highly encouraged.
- Interim operational measures will be taken.

Cogswell:

- 90% of watershed burned.
- There has been 6 times the annual sediment accumulation.
- Sediment has risen 30 feet at the face of the dam.
- Plan is to place sediment removed on a 27-acre portion of Cogswell Sediment Placement Site, 20 of which will need to be mitigated.

Pacoima:

- 76% of watershed burned.
- Sediment rose 15 feet at the face of the dam.
- 50% capacity is taken up.
- Plan is to sluice 2.4 MCY to Lopez Dam. The sediment would then be taken from Lopez Dam to Vulcan Pit.

Big Tujunga:

- 87% of watershed burned.
- Sediment rose 25 ft at the face of the dam.
- Plan is to bring removed sediment to already burned Maple Sediment Placement Site.

Morris:

- 35% of watershed burned.
- Plan is to truck to local mining areas.
- Currently completing mitigated negative declaration.

More sediment is expected to come in over the next 5 years. There will be community meetings held on weeknights and weekends regarding these projects.

Questions and Comments on Post-Fire Reservoir Sediment Removal

Q: Have other are Sediment Placement Sites besides Maple Sediment Placement Site been burned?

A: Some have been burned. Cogswell Sediment Placement Site was not.

Q: Where is the ~25,000 CY from Devil's Gate proposed to go?

A: Scholl Canyon Landfill.

Q: For which reservoir cleanouts was La Tuna Sediment Placement Site supposed to be the sediment placement location?

A (Chris Stone, DPW): Multiple projects were being considered – possibly Big Tujunga, which would be a multi-year cleanout process. La Tuna will now go through the Strategic Plan process and alternate placement sites will be used for upcoming reservoir cleanouts.

Q: Where do we find information regarding any upcoming scoping meetings?

A: DPW will be diligent about sharing this information. Information will also be placed on the reservoir cleanout website [<http://www.dpw.lacounty.gov/wrd/Removal/index.cfm>].

Q: When will the initial environmental study at Cogswell be completed?

A: There is currently no timeline.

Q: How many small debris basins are located in the areas affected by recent fires?

A: Approximately 28 debris basins.

Q: Will there be EIRs for all of the reservoir cleanout projects?

A: Only for Devil's Gate as directed by the Board of Supervisors.

Q: If DPW is not pursuing La Tuna, why are there "death tags" to cut down oaks?

A: The tags on the trees are not to indicate that those trees will be cut down but rather used for a biological survey of the area.

Comment: A list of attendees should be put online.

Response (Diego Cadena, DPW): We will have to talk to our County Council before we share any contact information. We must respect peoples' privacy. [We will provide names of attendees, but emails will remain private.]

Other comments:

- It is still unclear what happened in Arcadia. Did it happen because material could not be sluiced? Isn't DFG a trustee for public lands? It doesn't make sense.

- Clarification should be given about the different CEQA document - Mitigated Negative Declarations, EIRs, EAs ... etc.
- An EIR should be completed for all projects. It is the only way to build confidence in the operations of the Department.
- What will we do when the pits are all gone? Sustainable solutions need to be developed.
- Why can't we use the sediment to build barrier to protect the San Onofre Nuclear Plant and the millions of people in San Diego from tsunamis?
- Managers/decision makers should go out to the field and see these sites they are giving approval to destroy. The trees torn down will not be restored within our lifetimes.
- There is a large range of emotions under all of these comments and DPW needs to listen carefully.

Comments noted.

Wrap Up

Gary Hildebrand wrapped up the meeting by discussing how the region's sediment affects us all. He spoke of the need to continue to collectively develop optimal solutions for this difficult problem we are facing. Water Resources Division and Watershed Management Division are working very closely on all of these projects. Both divisions are also working very closely with DPW administration.

Given the complexity, regional impacts, and broad interests in sediment management and drawing on the experience with the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan agencies DPW realized that creating a small advisory group to provide decision-making guidance on the sediment management projects could be fruitful. Therefore, DPW Administration decided to form a small Sediment Management Advisory Working Group to provide additional input and perspective based on the members' diverse experience and key roles in the stakeholder community. This group is comprised of:

- Tim Brick, Managing Director of the Arroyo Seco Foundation,
- Jerry Burke, Assistant Public Works Director and City Engineer for the City of Glendora,
- Rebecca Drayse, Director of Tree People's Natural Urban Systems Group,
- Tom Erb, Director of Water Resources at the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power,
- Laura Garrett, Conservation Chair of the Pasadena Audubon,
- Frank Girardot, Editor of the Pasadena Star-News,
- Dr. Shelly Luce, Executive Director of the Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission,
- Jeff Pratt, Director of the County of Ventura Public Works Agency,
- Dan Rix, City Engineer for the City of Pasadena, and
- Tony Zampello, Assistant Executive Officer of the Main San Gabriel Basin.

The group will be providing feedback on all of the Flood Control District's sediment management efforts which DPW will compile and share with the stakeholders.

Gary thanked everyone for attending and expressed his hope for continued participation in the development of the Sediment Management Strategic Plan and our upcoming reservoir cleanout projects.

**Sediment Management Strategic Plan
Task Force Meeting # 2 Attendee List**

Agency/Organization	Name	Title
Arroyo Seco Foundation	Tim Brick	Managing Director
California Department of Fish and Game	Helen Birss	Environmental Program Manager
California Department of Fish and Game	Terri Dickerson	Senior Environmental Scientist
California Dept. of Fish and Game	Kelly Schmoker	
California Native Plant Society/Public	Barbara Eistenstein	
California Native Plant Society/ Theodore Payne Foundation	Snowdy Dodson	Board Member
California Regional Water Quality Control Board - Los Angeles Region	Deb Smith	
California Regional Water Quality Control Board - Los Angeles Region	LB Nye	
California Regional Water Quality Control Board - Los Angeles Region	Sam Unger	Executive Officer
Chevy Chase Estates Garden Club	Marianne Bamford	Treasurer
Chevy Chase Estates Garden Club	Mary Betlach	President
Chief Transportation & Engineering Contractors	Jose L. Aceituno	Estimator / Project Manager
City of LA - CD #2	Mary Benson	Community Representative
City of Sierra Madre	Oliver Cramer	Analyst
Community Forest Advisory Committee/Theodore Payne Foundation	Lynette Kampe	Executive Director (Theodore Payne Foundation)
County of Los Angeles Department of Beaches and Harbors	Paul Wong	
Crescenta Valley Town Council	Charly Shelton	
CUCA	Roberta Medford	
EnviroMINE Inc.	Crystal Howard	Manager
Friends of Hahamonga	Mary Barrie	
Hintz & Balvin Communications	Christle Balvin	
LA-32 Neighborhood Council & Sierra Club - Angeles Chapter	Tom Williams	Board Member
Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council	Nancy Steele	Executive Director
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power	Susan Avila Suarez	
Neighborhood Unitarian Church	Robin Robinson	
Neighborhood Unitarian Universalist Church - 7th Principle Committee	Hennelore Bauer	
Pasadena Audubon	Laura Garrett	
Public	Alex Squiers	
Public	Allen Savedoff	
Public	Andrea Hessing	

Agency/Organization	Name	Title
Public	Bill Eutz	
Public	Bill Weisman	
Public	Bruce Campbell	
Public	Cam Stone	
Public	Dan Kronstadt	
Public	Darren Thorne	
Public	Dave Czamanske	
Public	Elizabeth Lanski	
Public	Emma Stark	
Public	Ginger Alberti	
Public	Ginny Heringer	
Public	Glen Owens	
Public	James Kimmick	
Public	Janica Jones	
Public	Karen Bonfigli	
Public	Laurie Walcutt	
Public	Lisa Novick	
Public	Lori Paul	
Public	Madeline Graham	
Public	Marianne Simort	
Public	Mary Hayden	
Public	Michael Sabo	
Public	Millie Paul	
Public	Morton Gorel	
Public	Robert Conner	
Public	Robert Ruby	
Public	Rody Stephenson	
Public	Roger Klemm	
Public	Sally Kalaghan	
Public	Scott Wilson	
Public	Sharon Olsen	
Public	Susan Bartow	
Public	Suzanna Mast	
Public	Terry Young	
Public	Tori Collender	
Public	William Bertrand	
Public	Wynesta Dale	
Raymond Basin Management Board	Tony Zampello	Executive Officer
Republic Services	Ruford Garcia	Communications Relation Manager
Resident - Shadow Hills/La Tuna Cyn	Julia Tarnawski	Public
Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County	Sam Shammass	Project Engineer

Agency/Organization	Name	Title
Sierra Club	Don Berner	
Sierra Club	Linda Doran	
Slake Magazine	Emily Green	
Stetson Engineers, Inc. (Raymond Basin Management Board)	Steve Johnson	Corporate Senior Vice-President, Principal Engineer
Theodore Payne Foundation	Andrew Peck	
Theodore Payne Foundation	Ann Schultz	
Theodore Payne Foundation	Destiny Floyd	
Theodore Payne Foundation	Imran Asif	
Theodore Payne Foundation	Kevin Steinhauer	
Theodore Payne Foundation	Leslie Lipton	
Thomas Payne Foundation	Jeanne Kirhofer	
Trammell Crow Company	Jason Gremillion	
Transition San Fernando Valley	Bruce Woodside	Steering Committee Member
U.S. Forest Service - Angeles National Forest	Esmeralda Bracamonte	San Gabriel River Ranger District Resources Officer
U.S. Forest Service - Angeles National Forest	Tasha Hernandez	Santa Clara/Mojave Rivers Ranger District Resources Officer
United Rock Products	Russ Caruso	
Urban Wild Network	Laurie Gould	
Urban Wild Network	Susan Rudnicki	
Vulcan Materials Company	Jeff Camron	
Vulcan Materials Company	Mike Linton	Vice President
Waste Connections Inc. - SCS Engineers	Robert Johnson	Senior Project Director
Weston Solutions	Michael Drennan	Vice President, California Regional Manager
Weston Solutions	Rod Tobias	

[This page has been left blank intentionally]



**Los Angeles County Flood Control District
Sediment Management Strategic Plan Task Force Meeting # 3**



**Wednesday, June 29, 2011
2:30 pm to 4:30 pm**

LA County Department of Public Works Headquarters Building
900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803
Conference Rooms B&C

Goal

Manage sediment in order to provide for the flood risk management and water conservation needs of the region while balancing environmental, social, and economic concerns.

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Follow-up from the Second Task Force Meeting
3. Background on Sediment Processes
4. Sediment Management Alternatives
5. Alternatives Ranking Tool
6. Feedback Received
7. Tentative Ranking Results & Next Steps
8. Moderated Discussion
9. Wrap-up

Notes

Please email questions and comments regarding the Sediment Management Strategic Plan to SedimentMgmtPlan@dpw.lacounty.gov.

For additional information regarding all sediment management projects please visit www.lasedimentmanagement.com.



**Los Angeles County Flood Control District
Sediment Management Strategic Plan Task Force Meeting # 3**

**Wednesday, June 29, 2011
2:30 pm to 4:30 pm**



LA County Department of Public Works Headquarters Building
900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803
Conference Rooms B & C

Meeting Summary

Note: For reference purposes the following are included in the meeting summary:

- Meeting agenda (page 8).
- Invitation list for the meeting (page 9).
- List of attendees (page 15).

Welcome & follow-up from the second Task Force meeting

Gary Hildebrand, Division Head of the Watershed Management Division of the Department of Public Works (Public Works), welcomed Task Force members, discussed the agenda, and summarized the major themes of comments from the last Task Force meeting. The major themes included:

- Openness and the need for transparency.
- Care for the environment.
- The need for long-term sustainable solutions.

Gary shared that during the initial meetings with the Sediment Management Advisory Working Group the Working Group raised many of the same concerns as the Task Force.

Background on Sediment Processes

Marcela Benavides of the Watershed Management Division discussed the following:

- A history of major flooding in the Los Angeles Basin, the creation of the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (Flood Control District), and the construction of dams.
- A description of sediment accumulation and its affect on dam operations.
- Debris basins and their operation.
- The reasons why the Sediment Management Strategic Plan is being developed.

Sediment Management Alternatives

Gerard Dalziel of AECOM, a member of the consultant team working on the Sediment Management Study, discussed the transportation alternatives and sediment processing and placement site types under consideration.

- Transportation alternatives include:
 - Trucking - standard, low emission, and in channels.

- Cable bucket systems.
- Conveyor belts.
- Sluicing and slurry pipelines.
- A combination of trucking and rail transport.
- Processing location alternatives include:
 - Existing processing facilities.
 - New processing facilities in industrial areas, landfills, and active sediment placement sites (SPSs) and remote or residential areas with recoverable or sensitive habitat.
- Placement alternatives include:
 - Currently active and new SPSs either on Flood Control District property or newly acquired property.
 - Quarry pits.
 - Ocean placement and beach replenishment.
 - Landfills as daily or final cover.

Alternatives Ranking Tool

Bill Brownlie of Tetra Tech Inc., another member of the consultant team working on the Sediment Management Study, described the tool being used to rank the various alternatives

- The ranking tool is composed of five major factors, each which is scored to a maximum of 10 points, with 10 being best. The factors are:
 - Environmental Factor
 - Social/Quality of Life Factor
 - Performance Factor
 - Implementability Factor
 - Cost Factor
- Each factor is composed of several criteria. The maximum points attributed to each criterion within a factor are based on the relative importance of that criterion when compared with the other criteria in the same factor.
- A description of how the criteria are scored and how the tool is used was provided.

Feedback Received

Dan Sharp of the Watershed Management Division discussed the feedback received from the last meeting and how it had been implemented into the ranking tool, as summarized below.

- Add long-term (>20 year) sustainability → The tool now includes a Performance Factor that includes long term needs.
- Add wildlife corridors to the environment factors under consideration → Corridors were included in the Environmental Factor criteria.
- Include effects on groundwater recharge → Recharge was included as a criterion in the Environmental Factor.
- Consider effects on recreation → Added as a criterion in the Social Factor.
- Screen for the environment first → The tool was revised to add the ability to isolate and review the social and environmental factors.

Tentative Ranking Results & Next Steps

Dan explained the tool had been used to rank the alternatives based on the tool's Environmental Factor and the Social/Quality of Life Factor only, with a 50 percent weight applied to each factor. He presented and discussed the tentative rankings of the transportation, processing locations, and placement alternatives that resulted from that approach. Comments on the ranking tool and tentative results were requested by July 14th [The due date was changed to July 18th at 9 am subsequent to the meeting].

The next steps are as follows:

- Incorporate feedback from the Task Force on the ranking tool and tentative results.
- Combine transportation alternatives with processing location and placement alternatives.
- Analyze cost, performance, and implementability for the subregional solutions.

Moderated Discussion

1. Dave Czamanske - Sierra Club

- What happens at a sediment processing site? What comes in/goes out?

Response: The facility would take our unprocessed material and turn it into usable material like construction material.

- What about using the sediment for construction materials? How do you deal with organics?

Response: We are currently working on that with our consultants. Representative sediment samples taken from three of our facilities have not shown significant organic content; however there are ways to deal with the organics if they are there.

2. Vicki Brink - Foothill Trails District Neighborhood Council, Equestrian Center Owner/Operator

- I have tried to get the sand from Santa Anita. We pay \$600 for 15 CY of sand. Equestrian and other private facilities have a great need for sand. Everything behind Santa Anita Dam is usable. It's a great commodity; let's try to use all of it. Talk to the Vulcan Pit operators; placement in a quarry is good. Was the community near Santa Anita Dam and Santa Anita Sediment Placement Site aware a conveyor belt was going to be used? It is going to be loud.

Response: The Flood Control District definitely agrees with trying to beneficially use as much of the sediment as possible. Use of sediment is looking promising.

- Placing sediment in La Tuna Canyon does not make sense; it seems sediment would be moved from behind one dam to a site behind another dam.

Response: There is little erosion at sediment placement sites due to the way drainage is configured at the sites.

3. Teresa Young - San Gabriel Mountains Regional Conservancy

- Beginning to understand what the Flood Control District is working on.
- Personal experience with conveyor belts is that they are extremely noisy. A slurry pipeline is less noisy however sediment movement is an on and off process which may cause the pipe

to become caked with material. Paint pipe to blend in with environment. May be better than trucks.

- How do you realistically weigh environmental questions including the true impact to bird populations? Birds may disappear during times of disturbance but can come back. It is difficult to assess the true value of environmental areas since they are ecological systems. The Flood Control District should not go through sensitive areas.

Response: The Flood Control District agrees and does not mean to diminish any the comments, but there are some sites that may be reasonably considered to have a much higher environmental impact than others.

4. Snowdy Dodson - California Native Plant Society/Theodore Payne Foundation

- After all of the dams and debris basins were put up, this area became unsustainable. Are there any plans in the works to eliminate the need for dams or debris basins?

Response: We have a two-fold issue. We have infrastructure (that is, the dams and channels) resulting from the decisions that were made many decades ago on how flood risk and water conservation would be managed in the Los Angeles Basin. We are living with the system resulting from the decisions made many decades ago. For the immediate near future (say 20-30 years), we need to make sure the system we currently have is able to perform its functions and so we need to identify and implement solutions in a relatively short time frame (next few decades). Looking way down the line, at a much longer term period, there are studies that are under way to see if we can incorporate some more natural, sustainable features. Studies underway with the Army Corps of Engineers include ecosystem restoration studies along the Los Angeles River and Arroyo Seco. We need to see what we can do within existing constraints including development has been built right up to the channel system. It took us many decades to get to where we are today, it will take us many decades to change the system as a whole.

5. Linda Doran - Sierra Club

- We have a highly unnatural system. Are there any engineering solutions that could start to let some of the sediment flow downstream? There is a CALTECH study concerning 20-year cycles in sediment production. Using sediment and filling pits with sediment is great, but we have a lot more sediment to deal with in the long term. We cannot hold the mountains back. Sediment production will continue. We need a 100 or 150-year plan. We need to allow the rivers to become more natural and carry sediment to the beach. Maybe we need to start buying property where the floodplain would be. We don't want the rivers to meander all over, but let the river be a river. Can we find an in-between plan? Let's think of a plan 100 years out so we can start to live more sustainably.

6. Kiran Magiawala – Public (Retired Engineer)

- American Rivers is a large non-profit organization that looks at the long-term revitalization of rivers.
- Start a long-term study and include long-term issues and pass it on through generations if scope is too large.
- In regards to placing sediment on landfills, maybe using the clay materials in the sediment as landfill caps may reduce methane emissions from the landfills.

7. Susan Rudnicki - Urbanwild Network

- Under the cost factor on the tool there is no analysis for the loss of mature habitat. There are monetary values for individual trees. The values should be quantified, that is very important to make decisions.
- It has been mentioned that a lot of time is needed to change the system as a whole. On the Mississippi River floodplain, the Army Corps of Engineers has been forced to make choices as to what is going to be in the flooding. In the event of a catastrophe, time will be taken away from us.

8. Paul Wong - County of Los Angeles, Department of Beaches and Harbors

- The ranking tool and effort seem to be fair. However, there may be some lack of knowledge about the coastal area.
- At Broad Beach in Malibu they are trying to place 600,000 CY of material on their beaches; they are looking at dredging it from offshore locations. The cost of dredging offshore to replenish the beach is expected to cost \$20-30 per cubic yard (CY). Investigate cost sharing of beach nourishment. Offshore pit resulting from the dredging of sand for beach replenishment may accelerate beach erosion at nearby beaches.
- Another placement option to consider is off the coast of Redondo Beach where there is a marine canyon, which has a long-term capacity on the order of 1 billion CY. If there is a long-term, renewable permit with the respective environmental agencies, it can be assured that there will be capacity for the next 100 years.

9. Lynnette Kampe - Theodore Payne Foundation

- The Theodore Payne Foundation is opposed to destruction of natural resources for the purpose of debris disposal.
- Consider the diversity of the plant community in addition to oaks. There are many unique plant communities that need to be considered.
- It is a hopeful beginning to see the public desire to protect natural spaces recognized as well as the redirection of thought to use the sediment instead of disposing of it. The stakeholders will be watching the rest of the process to see the results.

10. Scott Wilson - North East Trees

- Perpetuation of the current practices is making the situation worse. Put the material where nature meant it to go, i.e., where we are now sitting. It seems as though the Flood Control District disregards the value of trees because it owns a piece of property. It gets more expensive every time we do the same thing. If it's too much to handle now, use 1 percent of available funding per year to produce long-term sediment management solutions. If you don't do anything towards it, it will never happen.

11. Nancy Woodruff - Foothill Trails District Neighborhood Council

- Learned about La Tuna Canyon Sediment Placement Site (SPS) about a year and a half ago. La Tuna Canyon is a ravine behind La Tuna Debris Basin. It doesn't make sense to fill a ravine with sediment. A 100-year plan would make more sense than a 20-year plan. The La Tuna Canyon community would like Public Works to continue to consider Vulcan Pit. We need a specific plan emphasizing the high value of habitat. Currently there are more environmental concerns and protections via plans for La Tuna Canyon than there were when the site in La Tuna Canyon was designated as an SPS.

Response: We have investigating placing sediment at pits very seriously.

12. Lori Paul - Biologist/Naturalist

- What is the cost of the current planning effort costing the tax payers? I heard someone say \$1.5 Million.

Response: The total contract with the consultant is approximately \$850,000. There are additional optional tasks for about \$500,000 that we do not know if we will need.

- The ranking spreadsheet is an arcane tool. What is restorable habitat? The devil is in the details; if bad data is used then results are faulty. Areas that have habitat value should never be considered. All areas with habitat should be removed entirely from consideration and placed in a conservation easement or protected somehow. Using of sediment and sluicing should be a priority.

Response: At this point we are evaluating the alternatives with a very broad brush to put them in relative categories. In the next phase of analysis, we will identify specific sites and get into the details.

13. Caroline Brown – Public (Resident of Sierra Madre)

- Could the channels be redesigned to handle bulked flow and allow the sediment to flow through?
- There are a lot of empty areas between the mountains and the harbor covered with cement. Why not place solar panels there? Sediment could be used to bulk up areas where needed.

14. Cameron Stone – Public

- The natural system historically got sediment to the ocean. At that time sediment used to be a valuable resource. When the infrastructure was built to control water, sediment became a waste product and nothing was built to handle it. We spent money on infrastructure to deal with other waste products such as sewage. We need to come up with a system to use natural processes to move and process the sediment.

Teresa Young - San Gabriel Mountains Regional Conservancy (Spoke 3rd)

- Mitigation can't always make up for losses. Areas like the Arcadia Woodlands can't be mitigated; they are irreplaceable. Habitat mitigation studies have shown that habitat mitigation has been done poorly and isn't always successful. For example, mitigating with seedlings in a new area does not always work. Mitigation is a very poor stopgap.

15. Snowdy Dodson - California Native Plant Society/Theodore Payne Foundation

- What specific kinds of comments do you want for the 7/14 deadline?

Response: Comments on the ranking tool itself and the scores given; however, any comments are welcome. The ranking tool will be available for download on our website (www.lasedimentmanagement.com). We understand there is a lot of information there, but we would like to keep our process as transparent as possible. In the next step we will look at specific details. *[The deadline for comments was changed to July 18th at 9 am subsequent to the meeting]*

Dave Czamanske – Sierra Club (Spoke 1st)

- Consider extending the deadline of when the comments are due. [*The deadline for comments was changed to July 18th at 9 am subsequent to the meeting*]

16. Julia Tarnawski - Resident of Shadow Hills/La Tuna Canyon

- There are about 60 oak trees that have been marked in the La Tuna Canyon area; that is very threatening.

Response: Those are biological survey markers that identify that tree has been quantified and identified. It is not to indicate that any trees will be removed.

Reservoir Cleanout Projects Update

Keith Lilley of the Water Resources Division is the new project manager for the upcoming reservoir cleanout projects, including the Devil's Gate Dam cleanout. He provided an update on the sediment cleanout projects and specifically the Devil's Gate Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Chambers Group has been hired to prepare the EIR. The initial scoping meeting for Devil's Gate is scheduled to be in September or October 2011.

Information regarding reservoir cleanout projects currently in the planning phase can be found at www.lasedimentmanagement.com.

Wrap Up

Gary Hildebrand thanked the attendees for their participation. He explained that the next steps will be evaluating how the alternatives can be applied to each sub-regional grouping. The next Task Force Meeting is tentatively planned for sometime in late August. Lastly, he requested comments on the alternatives ranking tool by July 14th, and closed the meeting. [The deadline for comments has since been postponed until Monday, July 18, 2011]

**Sediment Management Strategic Plan
Task Force Meeting # 3 Attendee List**

Agency/Organization	Name	Title
Arroyo Seco Foundation	Wilson Lau	Watershed Coordinator
California Native Plant Society/ Theodore Payne Foundation	Snowdy Dodson	Board Member
California Regional Water Quality Control Board - Los Angeles Region	LB Nye	
City of Arcadia Public Works Services Department	Tom Tait	Public Works Director
City of Los Angeles City Council District 2	Mary Benson	Senior Community Representative
City of Monrovia	Mark Carney	Department Director
City of Santa Clarita	Kerry Breyer	Senior Engineer
Community Forest Advisory Committee/Theodore Payne Foundation	Lynette Kampe	Executive Director
County of Los Angeles Department of Beaches and Harbors	Paul Wong	Chief, Planning Division
EnviroMINE, Inc.	Crystal Howard	Manager
Foothill Municipal Water District	Nina Jazmadarian	General Manager
Foothill Trails District Neighborhood Council	Vikki Brink	Committee E8 Chair (Equestrian)
Foothill Trails District Neighborhood Council	Nancy Woodruff	President
Friends of Hahamonga	Mary Barrie	
Katherine Padilla & Associates (KP&A)	Katherine Padilla	President
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power	Susan Avila Suarez	
Los Angeles/San Gabriel River Watershed Council	Deborah Glaser	Policy & Comm.
Neighborhood Unitarian Church	Robin Robinson	
Public	Nils Brink	
Public	Caroline Brown	
Public	Kiran Magiawala	
Public	Glen Owens	
Public	Lori Paul	
Public	Cam Stone	
Public (Resident of Shadow Hills/La Tuna Canyon)	Julia Tarnawski	Public
Public	Scott Wilson	
Public	Terry Young	
Raymond Basin Management Board	Wendy La	Staff Engineer
San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy	Luz Torres	Staff Biologist

Agency/Organization	Name	Title
Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County	Sam Shammas	Project Engineer
SCS Engineers	Dan Vidal	Project Director
Shadow Hills Property Owners Association (SHPOA)	Dave DePinto	
Sierra Club	Dave Czamanske	
Sierra Club	Linda Doran	
Slake Magazine	Emily Green	
Stetson Engineers, Inc. (Raymond Basin Management Board)	Steve Johnson	Corporate Senior Vice-President, Principal Engineer
Total Transportation Services, Inc.	Tony Williamson	Director, Business Development & Diversity Services
U.S Forest Service - Angeles National Forest	Graham Breakwell	
United Rock Products	Russ Caruso	
United States Forest Service	Chris Fabbro	Lands Specialist
Urbanwild Network	Laurie Gould	
Urbanwild Network	Susan Rudnicki	
US Army Corps of Engineers	Mike Farris	O&M Section Chief
USDA - Forest Service	Sean Barry	Assistant Resource Officer - San Gabriel River Regional District
Vulcan Materials Company	Jeff Cameron	
Vulcan Materials Company	Gary Goellner	Regional Operation Manager
Vulcan Materials Company	Mike Linton	Vice President
Watershed Conservation Authority	Jane Beesley	Deputy Executive Officer
Watershed Conservation Authority	Rob Romanek	Project Manager
Weston Solutions	Michael Drennan	Vice President, California Regional Manager



**Los Angeles County Flood Control District
Sediment Management Strategic Plan Task Force Meeting # 4**



**Wednesday, September 7, 2011
2:00 pm to 4:00 pm**

LA County Department of Public Works Headquarters Building
900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803
Conference Room C

Goal

Manage sediment in order to provide for the flood risk management and water conservation needs of the region while balancing environmental, social, and economic concerns.

Agenda

1. Welcome and introduction
2. Planning quantities
3. Alternatives analysis process
4. Analysis of transportation alternatives for sediment from two groups of debris basins in the West Area
 - Truck to existing rail network
 - Cable/buckets systems
 - Low emission trucking
 - Conveyor systems
 - Standard trucking
 - Trucking in channels
 - Slurry pipelines
 - New rail lines
 - Sluicing in existing channels
5. Analysis of placement alternatives for sediment from two groups of debris basins in the West Area
 - Sanitary landfills for cover
 - Remote locations with recoverable habitat
 - Pits
 - Beaches
 - Inert debris fill operations
 - Offshore
6. *Devil's Gate Environmental Impact Report process – brief update*
7. Next steps & closing remarks

Released to the public on November 1, 2011



**Los Angeles County Flood Control District
Sediment Management Strategic Plan Task Force Meeting # 4**



**Wednesday, September 7, 2011
2:00 pm to 4:00 pm**

LA County Department of Public Works Headquarters Building
900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803
Conference Room C

Meeting Summary

Note: For reference purposes the following are included in the meeting summary, which may also be found at our website, www.lasedimentmanagement.com.

- Meeting agenda (page 8).
- Invitation list for the meeting (page 9).
- List of attendees (page 14).

The PowerPoint presentation from the meeting can also be found on the website.

Welcome and Introduction: Terri Grant

Terri Grant, Assistant Division Head of the Watershed Management Division, welcomed Task Force members, outlined the goals and agenda for the Task Force meeting, and presented the Strategic Plan Process and progress to date for this planning effort. The major focus of Task Force Meeting # 4 was to:

- Present detailed analyses of sediment transportation and placement alternatives for two groups of debris basins in the West Area of the Flood Control District; and
- Obtain feedback from the Task Force regarding which alternatives to evaluate further.

Terri also noted we are considering a longer term sustainable vision for the Flood Control District that includes mimicking natural sediment transport processes along with other modifications to the system.

Planning Quantities and Alternatives Analysis Process: Dan Sharp

Dan Sharp of the Watershed Management Division discussed the following:

- Key concepts:
 - Need to periodically remove sediment from reservoirs and debris basins in order to manage flood risk and provide for water conservation.
 - Pursuing sediment management with a balanced approach to environmental, social, and economic concerns.
- The derivation of the 20-year sediment management planning quantities for Flood Control District facilities for the period 2012-2032. The total is estimated to be over 80 million cubic yards (debris basins \approx 10 MCY and dams \approx 70 MCY) based on the 80th percentile of observed 20-year sediment production periods.

- Remaining capacity at active Sediment Placement Sites (SPSs) is small compared to 20-year planning quantities.
- Active SPSs will continue to be used while other sediment management solutions are developed.
- Flood Control District facilities within subregions West 2 and West 3 comprise 62 debris basins along the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains and Verdugo Hills. These debris basins have a combined 20-year sediment planning quantity of 3.6 MCY.
- The alternatives analysis process for West 2 and 3 are now being extended beyond environmental and social considerations to encompass project performance, implementability, and cost.
- Sediment processing for commercial reuse of the sediment is currently under investigation.

Analysis of Transportation Alternatives: Gerard Dalziel

Gerard Dalziel of AECOM presented the analysis of the following sediment transportation alternatives for subregions West 2 and 3:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| • Truck to existing rail network | • Sluicing in existing channels |
| • Low emission trucking | • Cable/bucket systems |
| • Standard trucking | • Conveyor belt systems |
| • Slurry pipelines | • Trucking in channels |

New rail lines were not evaluated due to high environmental and social concerns.

Conclusion: Due to the wide geographic distribution and relatively small quantity of sediment coming into debris basins, trucking appears to be the most feasible alternative for the West 2 and West 3 subregions. We will continue to evaluate alternatives for debris basins in the remaining subregions. It was also noted that when we evaluate the reservoirs, more alternatives will likely be feasible due to relatively large sediment quantities located in a single location as well as the availability of water for sluicing and slurry pipelines.

Analysis of Transportation Alternatives: Open Discussion

1. Vic LaRosa, President, Total Transportation Services, Inc.
 - How many truckloads are envisioned for transporting 3.6 MCY of sediment?
Response: 3.6 MCY/10 CY per truck = 360,000 truckloads.
 - Was consideration given to trucking sediment at night?
Response: No, social impacts to residential communities would be more adverse than daytime operations when many people are away from home.
 - Was the difference in fuel costs for low emission trucks factored into the analysis?
Response: No, cost difference presented is based on the cost to bring in additional low emission trucks from outside of the region.
 - Currently the Port of Los Angeles is evaluating the performance of low emission trucks powered by liquid natural gas (LNG) and methane which have a diesel fuel cost equivalent of \$2.20-\$2.50 per gallon. In addition, testing of all-electric trucks using hydrogen fuel cell technology is underway with the delivery of the first such truck just

three weeks ago. Additional hydrogen gas distribution lines within the LA area are needed for this technology to reach its full potential. Initial testing of the all-electric trucks found them very powerful and quiet, and with the added benefit of having no polluting emissions.

Response: We would like to talk to you.

2. Rody Stephenson, Public

- Consider running slurry pipelines in the flood control channels and using saltwater for the water supply.

Response: This approach will be investigated.

3. Dave Weeshoff, President, San Fernando Valley Audubon Society

- Consider using effluent from the Tillman Water Reclamation Plant as a water source for sluicing and slurry pipeline operations. Currently most of this effluent flows down the Los Angeles River to the ocean.

Response: We will consider reclaimed water as a source of water for slurry pipelines and sluicing.

4. Unidentified Speaker

- Is the County looking for one solution for all situations, e.g., an infrastructure similar to a wastewater treatment system?

Response: No, the infrastructure for sediment management would only be used for particular events when it is needed. There is a constant supply of sewage [but not a constant supply of sediment].

5. Kiran Magiawala, Public

- The County of Los Angeles Sanitation Districts and the Metropolitan Water District should be consulted to determine the availability of excess reclaimed water that may be able to be used for the transport of sediment.

Response: This will be considered.

6. Kelly Schmoker, California Department of Fish and Game

- Are you going to consider lifetime cost? Some alternatives may have a lifetime that is longer than 20 years.

Response: Most alternatives can be adequately analyzed considering a 20-year period. If the lifetime of an alternative is longer than 20 years, we will consider that.

7. Mary Barrie, Friends of Hahamongna

- Maintenance roads adjacent to flood control channels being considered for the placement of slurry pipelines or conveyor belt systems are sometimes used as recreational trails. Recreational use may be a more important use.

Response: Impacts to recreation are part of the analysis.

8. Rody Stephenson, Public

- Will the remaining portion of the analysis address the Flood Control District's reservoirs and facilities in other areas?

Response: Yes.

Analysis of Placement Alternatives: Bill Brownlie

Bill Brownlie of Tetra Tech described the analysis of the following sediment placement alternatives for subregions West 2 and 3:

- Landfill cover
- Pits in industrial areas
- Inert debris fill operations
- Remote locations with recoverable habitat
- Beaches
- Offshore Placement

Conclusion: The use of sediment as landfill cover is an option for limited quantities and we will continue to pursue pits and inert debris fill operations. Beach replenishment and offshore disposal are technically feasible and can be pursued if partner agencies are identified or if other alternatives do not work out. No suitable remote locations were found. We are also discussing processing alternatives with the aggregate industry.

Analysis of Placement Alternatives: Open Discussion

Dan opened the discussion by pointing out that new SPSs in locations with sensitive habitat such as La Tuna Canyon were not being discussed since they are not being considered at this time while there are other viable placement alternatives.

9. Snowdy Dodson, Southern California Native Plant Society/Theodore Payne Foundation

- What is meant by “wet” vs. “dry” sediment?

Response: Sediment that is cleaned out from the debris basins during the storm season is likely to be wet due to flood runoff flowing through the basin. Sediment that is to be compacted needs to be dry, so wet sediment needs to be allowed to dry before compaction.

- Sage-scrub vegetation is valuable habitat and there is only 10% left in the area. Using sage-scrub habitat as an example of “recoverable” habitat is not a good example from that perspective. More appropriate examples of recoverable habitat include fallow agricultural land or barren areas that have had the top soil scraped clean. It is not just the plants that are important with respect to habitat but also the organisms such as bacteria, hibernating toads, etc. that are important components of the ecosystem.

Response: We will be more careful with our descriptions. Note that none of the alternatives under consideration affect any habitat, recoverable or sensitive.

10. Dianne Patrizzi, Public/Media

- Why are there debris basin cleanouts during the wet season?

Response: To manage the risk of flood. Sometimes sediment needs to be cleaned out during the wet season to recover space needed to capture sediment from subsequent storm events.

11. Theresa Young, San Gabriel Mountains Regional Conservancy

- The placement analysis did not consider the beneficial aspects of offshore sediment placement that could result from capping pollutants such as DDT. Offshore placement could improve the environmental health of the ocean, including the near-shore fish population.

Response: If offshore placement looks favorable based on the analysis, specific placement locations and other considerations will be taken into account.

12. Vic LaRosa, Total Transportation Services, Inc.

- Is processing of sediment for use in the construction industry under consideration? It could potentially offset some of the sediment management costs. Follow up on processing options and the quantities of materials needed by the aggregate industry.

Response: The Flood Control District is currently having discussions with the aggregate industry.

13. Rody Stephenson, Public

- Filling pits that have just been dug up doesn't seem to make sense.

Response: Filling pits is being evaluated along with the rest of the alternatives.

14. Mary Barrie, Friends of Hahamongna

- Where do landfills currently get the sediment they use for cover?

Response: Mainly from onsite grading operations.

15. Unidentified Speaker

- I think landfills need to mitigate for their operations. Could they utilize Flood Control District sediment as part of their mitigation?
- What percentage of the debris basin sediment is organic (containing roots and stumps)? What is the cost to remove the organics?

Response: Approximately 5-10% or sometimes higher depending on the watershed conditions (burned vs. unburned). The cost of processing is part of the discussions we are having with the aggregate industry.

16. Christle Balvin, Urbanwild Network

- Have you talked to any of the beach cities regarding sediment placement for beach nourishment?

Response: The Flood Control District has initiated discussions with the Los Angeles County Department of Beaches and Harbors regarding beach nourishment and we are aware there is currently a project at Broad Beach in Malibu.

- Laguna Beach sand losses have been extensive. Sediment is a valuable resource! It should be viewed in that light. We would like to talk to you further about the beach nourishment alternative.

Response: The Flood Control District is open to such discussions as well as working with other agencies although it looks like some cities and other agencies may have better options in terms of sources of beach sand.

17. Kiran Magiawala, Public

- Offshore studies conducted in 2005 of the tsunami hazard along the southern California coast should be reviewed as part of any proposal to place sediment offshore due to the potential to affect wave patterns.

Response: Studies would have to be conducted to determine the effects of offshore placement.

18. Cesar Espinosa, Los Angeles County Department of Beaches and Harbors

- Have there been discussions with the Port of Long Beach regarding the use of sediment for the Middle Harbor Redevelopment Project?

Response: Yes. We have been told they have sufficient sediment for the first phase of the project. We are aware there will be a second phase.

Correction: During the meeting it was indicated that we were told priority is given to contaminated sediment but the priority is given to dredged marine sediment.

19. Theresa Young, San Gabriel Mountains Regional Conservancy

- Please tell us what you have looked at so that we (the Task Force) can be more helpful.

Response: We will continue to provide regular updates to the Task Force.

20. Lynnette Kampe, Theodore Payne Foundation

- Can you repeat that La Tuna SPS is off the table?

Response: Though La Tuna isn't completely off the table, at this time we are focused on other alternatives that seem feasible and appropriate.

21. Snowdy Dodson, Southern California Native Plant Society/Theodore Payne Foundation

- Once the La Tuna Canyon SPS alternative is "off the table", the Flood Control District should transfer the land to a natural resource agency or County Parks for use as a recreation area and/or wildlife habitat.

Response: We could consider that option once other sediment management alternatives are developed.

Devil's Gate Environmental Impact Report Update: Keith Lilley

Keith Lilley of the Water Resources Division discussed the following:

- The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) process for the Devil's Gate Reservoir Sediment Removal and Management Project is underway. The EIR is being prepared by an environmental consulting firm, Chambers Group, with a target completion in 18-24 months.
- There are two public meetings scheduled as part of the EIR process. Fliers were made available after the meeting.
 - October 5, 2011 6:30-8:30 pm at the Rose Bowl in Pasadena
 - October 15, 2011 9-11 am at the La Cañada High School Cafeteria
- The Flood Control District has completed an interim sediment cleanout of 13,000 cubic yards at the face of the dam. This material has been temporarily placed at Johnson Field until the EIR is completed. The upcoming storm season will bring sediment to the face of the dam once again.
- Contract work currently going on includes the installation of walkways and modification of the trash rack as preventive measures. That work is anticipated to be completed in October.
- Additional information regarding the reservoir sediment removal projects is available at www.lasedimentmanagement.com.

Additional Comments from Task Force Members

22. Dave Czamanske

- The Task Force meetings are really information and status meetings rather than meetings to fully engage Task Force members in substantive tasks or activities that support the development of the Strategic Plan. The group should be renamed appropriately.

Response: Comment was noted.

- What is the relationship between the Advisory Working Group and the Task Force?

Response: Both the Advisory Working Group and Task Force are receiving the same briefing information and the feedback from the two groups is contributing to the process. We will bring an update at the next Task Force meeting.

23. Christle Balvin

- I now understand that the Devil's Gate Dam EIR process is separate from the development of the Strategic Plan, with the later being the focus of the Task Force meetings.

Next Steps & Closing Remarks: Terri Grant

At the conclusion of the meeting Terri confirmed that the Task Force meeting #4 PowerPoint slide presentation would be posted on the project website. She then thanked the attendees for their participation and adjourned the meeting.

**Sediment Management Strategic Plan
Task Force Meeting # 4 Attendee List**

Agency/Organization	Name	Title
Arroyo Seco Foundation	Tim Brick	Managing Director
Arroyo Seco Foundation	Jonathan Frame	Watershed Coordinator
California Department of Fish and Game	Terri Dickerson	Senior Environmental Scientist
California Department of Fish and Game	Kelly Schmoker	
California Native Plant Society/ Theodore Payne Foundation	Snowdy Dodson	Board Member
California Regional Water Quality Control Board - Los Angeles Region	LB Nye	
City of Burbank	Sean Corrigan	Chief City Engineer
City of Glendora	Jerry Burke	Assistant Public Works Director/City Engineer
City of Santa Clarita	Oliver Cramer	Analyst
Community Forest Advisory Committee/ Theodore Payne Foundation	Lynette Kampe	Executive Director
County of Los Angeles Department of Beaches and Harbors	Cesar Espinosa	Planner
Crescenta Valley Town Council	Charly Shelton	
EnviroMINE, Inc.	Crystal Howard	Manager
Public	Kiran Magiawala	
Public	Glen Owens	
Public	Bryan Helm	
Public	Thomas Holaday	
Public	Dianne Patrizzi	
Public	Robert Ruby	
Public	Carole Scurlock	
Public	Rody Stephenson	
Republic Services	David Cieply	General Manager
Resident - Shadow Hills/La Tuna Cyn	Julia Tarnawski	Public
Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County	Sam Shammas	Project Engineer
Sierra Club	Don Bremner	
Sierra Club Angeles Chapter	Joan Licari	Chair, San Gabriel Task Force
Total Transportation Services, Inc.	Tony Williamson	Director, Business Development & Diversity Services
Total Transportation Services, Inc.	Vic LaRosa	President
Total Transportation Services, Inc.	Bill Allen	
United Rock Products	Martin Fuentes	Operations Manager
Vulcan Materials Company	Jeff Cameron	
Vulcan Materials Company	Gary Goellner	Regional Operation Manager
Waste Connections Inc.	Mike Dean	District Manager
Waste Connections Inc. SCS Engineers	Dan Vidal	Project Director
Watershed Conservation Authority	Rob Romanek	Project Manager

[This page has been left blank intentionally]



**Los Angeles County Flood Control District
Sediment Management Strategic Plan
Stakeholder Task Force Meeting # 5**



**Tuesday, November 15, 2011
1:00 pm**

LA County Department of Public Works Headquarters Building
900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803
Conference Room B

Goal

Manage sediment in order to provide for the flood risk management and water conservation needs of the region while balancing environmental, social, and economic concerns.

Agenda

Welcome & Introduction

Follow-up from the Fourth Task Force Meeting

Pacoima & Morris Reservoirs - Analysis to Date

- Sediment Removal Alternatives
- Placement Alternatives
- Transportation Alternatives

Discussion

Devil's Gate Environmental Impact Report Process – Brief Update

Wrap-up/Next Steps



**Los Angeles County Flood Control District
Sediment Management Strategic Plan
Stakeholder Task Force Meeting # 5**



**Tuesday, November 15, 2011
1:00 pm**

LA County Department of Public Works Headquarters Building
900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803
Conference Room B

Meeting Summary

Note: For reference purposes the following are included in the meeting summary, which may be found at our website, www.lasedimentmanagement.com.

- Meeting agenda (page 7).
- Invitation list for the meeting (page 8).
- List of attendees (page 15).

The PowerPoint presentation from the meeting can also be found on the website.

Welcome and Introduction: Gary Hildebrand

Gary Hildebrand, Division Head of Watershed Management Division, welcomed Stakeholder Task Force members to the meeting. He told attendees that this meeting would provide an update on the status of the sediment management planning effort while sharing the analysis to date of alternatives for two reservoirs. The next Stakeholder Task Force meeting is expected to be in late January and will provide recommendations for sediment management at Pacoima and Morris Reservoirs. A subsequent Stakeholder Task Force meeting will be held to share the findings and recommendations for all Flood Control District reservoirs and debris basins.

Follow-up from the Fourth Stakeholder Task Force Meeting: Terri Grant

Terri Grant, Assistant Division Head of Watershed Management Division, provided the follow-up from last meeting. She addressed past inquiries to extend the 20-year Sediment Management Strategic Plan and indicated that the possibility of developing a separate Long-Term Vision for the Flood Control District in partnership with the Army Corps of Engineers is being investigated.

She described the purpose of the Task Force and explained the group will now be called the "Stakeholder Task Force" to reflect the fact that input and participation from all members of the community are welcome. She proceeded to describe the composition and purpose of the Advisory Working Group.

Next, Terri discussed the comprehensive timeline for sediment management. A schematic helped to illustrate the relation between ongoing sediment management projects, the

upcoming reservoir cleanouts, the 20-year Sediment Management Strategic Plan, and the Long-Term Flood Control District Vision.

Reservoir Analysis to Date: Dan Sharp

Dan Sharp of Watershed Management Division presented the reservoir analysis to date for both Pacoima and Morris Reservoirs. He started by reminding the Stakeholder Task Force how dams operate and what their purposes are. Dan also reminded everyone that during the initial ranking of alternatives only environmental and social impacts were considered. Now that the more in-depth analysis is being conducted, performance, implementability, and cost are also being considered. The discussion included:

- Possible placement sites
- Removal methods
- Staging areas
- Access to the reservoirs
- Modes of transportation

Dan also briefly discussed trucking in channels, new rail lines, a two-way salt water pipeline, and cable bucket systems. He indicated that as a result of the analysis it is recommended to no longer pursue these alternatives.

Discussion

1. Rody Stephenson, La Cañada-Flintridge Resident

- Some of the dams have permanent lakes. Devil's Gate is dry. How do you decide which dams are used to store water?

Response: It depends on the ability to conserve water downstream of the dam. There are no spreading grounds along the Arroyo Seco downstream of Devil's Gate Dam, so water from Devil's Gate flows to the Los Angeles River and ultimately the ocean. However, a small amount of groundwater recharge does occur from holding a pool at the dam. The Flood Control District has ongoing studies to evaluate the feasibility of pumping water from Devil's Gate Reservoir back to the existing Arroyo Seco Spreading Grounds and to Eaton Dam to enable recharge to occur in the spreading grounds along Eaton Wash.

2. Dave Weeshoff, Audubon Society

- When the dams were originally constructed, what were the Flood Control District's plans for removing sediment deposits?

Response: The dams were constructed with sluice gates to enable sediment movement through the dams to the downstream channels. In addition, sediment placement sites (SPSs) in close proximity to the dams were acquired for sediment placement purposes. Some of the SPSs are full and there are some challenges with sluicing, hence we are looking for the best alternatives to manage future sediment deposition.

3. Kiran Magiawala, Public

- There is an ongoing study for a desalination plant at Redondo Beach that will produce 25-50 million gallons per day of fresh water. Consideration should be given to any potential impacts that sediment management plans may have on the plant.

Response: We will do so.

4. Carl Hassel, City Engineer, City of Azusa

- Does the 5.2 MCY of sediment for Morris Reservoir include sediment from San Gabriel and Cogswell Reservoirs?

Response: No, that quantity is just for Morris Reservoir. The estimated 20-year quantity for San Gabriel Reservoir is approximately 29 MCY and for Cogswell Reservoir it is 5 MCY.

- Is this plan only for Pacoima and Morris Reservoirs?

Response: No, the next steps will include planning for the other reservoirs as well as debris basins in addition to Pacoima and Morris.

5. Snowy Dodson, California Native Plant Society

- Are any of the dams suitable to experiment with dam removal?

Response: That option could be studied as part of a future planning effort that looks at the entire system from a long-term perspective. The dams were built for flood control and water conservation and impacts will need to be evaluated.

- Could the big dams be removed and replaced with a series of smaller dams?

Response: Theoretically yes but it would be extremely difficult from a practical standpoint. The large dams are strategically located and it would be challenging to replace their benefit with a series of smaller dams.

6. Rody Stephenson, La Cañada-Flintridge Resident

- What percentage of water is captured and used for groundwater recharge?

Response: Over 90% of the San Gabriel River runoff is captured and recharged annually. Due to less favorable geologic conditions, recharge percentages on the Los Angeles River system are not as high.

- Would sediment placed in an upstream SPS likely wash out in future storms?

Response: Not likely because the sediment is placed methodically with a drainage system and is engineered to be stable. The bulk of the material stays where we place it.

Devil's Gate Environmental Impact Report Process – Brief Update: Keith Lilley

Keith Lilley, Assistant Division Head of Water Resources Division, provided a progress update on the preparation of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Devil's Gate Reservoir Sediment Removal and Management Project and the status of the Interim Measures Project for Devil's Gate Dam. Key points:

- EIR
 - At the two scoping meetings for the Devil's Gate EIR, the public showed a high interest in alternatives other than trucking because of the potential traffic and air quality impacts.
 - The EIR will address a full array of alternatives with technical studies and analyses.
 - A copy of the Draft EIR will be available in approximately 6-9 months. It will be available at the same locations that the Initial Study was.
 - Target completion date for the Devil's Gate EIR is late 2013.
 - Information regarding the EIR process is posted on the web at www.lasedimentmanagement.com/devilsgate. A summary of the public comments will also be posted on the website.
- Interim Measures Project
 - The Interim Measures Project to remove sediment that accumulated near the upstream face of the dam is complete.
 - 13,000 cubic yards of sediment were removed and temporarily placed at Johnson Field, an inactive former spreading ground upstream of the dam on the east side of the reservoir area.
 - Trash racks were extended vertically to reduce plugging of the dam outlet works from sedimentation.
 - New log booms were installed to capture floating debris and prevent it from reaching the face of the dam and interfering with flow through the outlet works.

Discussion

1. Snowdy Dodson, California Native Plant Society

- What is the bottom of the Devil's Gate Reservoir made of? Is it suitable for infiltration?
Response: The entire reservoir area has a natural earth bottom. However, deposition of fine sediment does tend to seal the bottom of the reservoir area minimizing infiltration.
- Could the reservoir bottom be punctured to improve infiltration of water?
Response: The holes would likely plug with sediment due to the high pressure exerted by the water and sediment above them. We have found that optimal infiltration is achieved in basins approximately 5 to 8 feet deep that have regular maintenance to keep the bottom free of fine sediment and vegetation.

2. Mary Barrie, Friends of Hahamongna

- Normally comments submitted are provided to the public in full during the EIR process. Why is it planned to only provide summaries of the comments?

Response: We will provide a summary of the comments received during the scoping process on our website. While not required by CEQA (the California Environmental Quality Act), we will include copies of the actual scoping comments in an appendix of the Draft EIR. Comments received during the public comment period after the Draft EIR is released are required to be included in the Final EIR.

- Why isn't water conservation at Devil's Gate Reservoir part of the current sediment management planning and normal dam operations?

Response: There are spreading grounds operated by the City of Pasadena at the upstream end of the reservoir; however, water conservation at Devil's Gate Dam is very limited because there are no downstream spreading grounds along the Arroyo Seco that can recharge dam releases to groundwater. The Flood Control District is evaluating potential projects that would pump water from Devil's Gate Reservoir to the upstream spreading grounds or to spreading grounds along Eaton Wash to the east.

3. Dave Weeshoff, Pasadena Audubon Society

- Where does the Arroyo Seco flow into?

Response: The Arroyo Seco flows into the Los Angeles River near the interchange of the 5 and 110 freeways, near downtown Los Angeles.

4. Rody Stephenson, La Cañada-Flintridge Resident

- Are there other EIRs currently being prepared for other projects in the Devil's Gate Reservoir area?

Response: Yes, there is a separate Hahamongna Multi-use Project EIR that is being prepared by the City of Pasadena.

- To what extent are the consultants working on the Devil's Gate EIR and the Sediment Management Strategic Plan working together? Collaboration could eliminate duplication of effort.

Response: Flood Control District staffs working on the projects are in constant contact.

- What about excavating a sediment trap upstream of the Devil's Gate Reservoir?

Response: This alternative will be evaluated as part of the EIR process.

5. Dave Weeshoff, Audubon Society

- Is there an opportunity for groundwater recharge along the Los Angeles River?

Response: The Dominguez Gap Spreading Grounds is the only location on the lower Los Angeles River affording an opportunity to recharge runoff. However, the underlying geology at that location is not favorable for infiltration.

- Could water be recharged to create a barrier against seawater intrusion into the groundwater table?

Response: We have an active program of injecting water along the coast to act as a seawater intrusion barrier. Approximately one third of the water used is reclaimed water.

Wrap-up/Next Steps

The next step is to complete the analysis for Pacoima and Morris Reservoirs. This analysis is planned to be presented at the next Stakeholder Task Force Meeting.

In addition, the analysis of the other reservoirs and the remaining debris basins will also be completed. The findings and recommendations for all of the remaining facilities will be shared at the beginning of a public review period.

Terri Grant responded as follows to questions regarding the Sediment Management Advisory Working Group.

- The Advisory Working Group meets approximately once a month and has met five times already.
- The Advisory Working Group meetings are not public meetings so as to keep the size of meetings small and potentially more efficient from a time standpoint while retaining input from a broad range of representatives. However, the public is welcome to the Stakeholder Task Force meetings.
- The Advisory Working Group will remain active for the future long-term planning effort that will review the Flood Control District system of facilities and operations.
- The Advisory Working Group members are open to receiving comments from the public. *[Note – Their emails are now available on the sediment management website (www.lasedimentmanagement.com)]*

A final comment by one of the attendees was that the Advisory Working Group appears to be heavily weighted towards environmental interests and that consideration should be given to adding more business and local governmental entities to the Advisory Working Group.

Gary Hildebrand thanked the attendees for their participation and adjourned the meeting at 2:30 pm.

**Sediment Management Strategic Plan
Stakeholder Task Force Meeting # 5 Attendee List**

Agency/Organization	Name	Title
City of Azusa	Carl Hassel	City Engineer
City of Santa Clarita	Kerry Breyer	Senior Engineer
Community Forest Advisory Committee/ Theodore Payne Foundation	Lynette Kampe	Executive Director
EnviroMINE, Inc.	Crystal Howard	Manager
Englander Knabe & Allen (EKA)	Alex Cherin	Vice President
Friends of Hahamongna	Mary Barrie	
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power	Andy Niknafs	
Neighborhood Unitarian Church	Hannelore Bauer	
Neighborhood Unitarian Church	Robin Robinson	
Public	Dave Czamanske	
Public	Kiran Magiawla	
Public	Rody Stephenson	
Public	Wynesta Dale	
San Fernando Valley Audubon Society	Dave Weeshoff	President
Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County	Sam Shammass	Project Engineer
Theodore Payne Foundation	Snowdy Dodson	Board Member
Total Transportation Services, Inc.	Tony Williamson	Director, Business Development & Diversity Services
Total Transportation Services, Inc.	Richard Echler	Development Manager
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Los Angeles District (SPL)	Tomas G. Beauchamp	Chief, Operations Branch
Vulcan Materials Company	Gary Goellner	Regional Operation Manager
Waste Connections Inc.	Steve Cassulo	Administration
Watershed Conservation Authority	Rob Romanek	Project Manager



**Los Angeles County Flood Control District
Sediment Management Strategic Plan Task Force Meeting # 6**



**Monday, February 6, 2012
2:30 pm**

LA County Department of Public Works Headquarters Building
900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803
Alhambra Room

Goal

Manage sediment in order to provide for the flood risk management and water conservation needs of the region while balancing environmental, social, and economic concerns.

Agenda

Welcome & Introduction

Follow-up from the Fifth Task Force Meeting

Pacoima & Morris Reservoirs - Analysis to Date
- Combined sediment management alternatives & estimated costs

Discussion

Devil's Gate Environmental Impact Report Process – Brief Update

Wrap-up/Next Steps



**Los Angeles County Flood Control District
Sediment Management Strategic Plan
Stakeholder Task Force Meeting # 6**



**Monday, February 6, 2012
2:30 pm**

LA County Department of Public Works Headquarters Building
900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803
Alhambra Room

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introduction: Terri Grant

Terri Grant, Assistant Division Head of Watershed Management Division, welcomed Stakeholder Task Force members to the meeting. Terri announced that work on the Strategic Plan continued and that the Strategic Plan was expected to be released in mid-April. She shared that in January the Advisory Working Group had been on a field trip of several Flood Control District facilities. She also shared that the Flood Control District had met with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to discuss development of a Long-Term Vision and that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers had given a presentation to the Advisory Working Group meeting. Terri also mentioned that the Flood Control District was continuing to talk to the aggregate industry and determining the best way to include the aggregate industry in the sediment management process. Terri explained that the purpose of the meeting was to share the analysis of alternatives for Morris and Pacoima Reservoirs and to obtain input from the Stakeholder Task Force.

Timeline: Dan Sharp

Dan Sharp of Watershed Management Division reviewed the status of the project in terms of the past Stakeholder Task Force meetings and the future meeting and public review period. He also reviewed the relationship between the Strategic Plan and the debris basin cleanouts, the planning of the Station Fire Reservoir Cleanouts, other future reservoir cleanouts, and the Long-Term Vision.

Morris and Pacoima Reservoirs Alternatives Review: Dan Sharp

1. Morris Reservoir

Dan presented a map that showed the location of Morris Reservoir in relation to San Gabriel Reservoir, the San Gabriel River, San Gabriel Canyon Road, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Santa Fe Flood Control Basin, and the pits in Irwindale. He then discussed the five combined sediment management alternatives considered for Morris Reservoir – (1) Excavation + Truck, (2) Excavation + Conveyor, (3) Dredge + Pipe, (4) Dredge + Truck,

and (5) Sluicing – along with the general impacts and/or concerns and the estimated 20-year cost of implementing each alternative. Dan concluded his discussion about the alternatives considered for Morris Reservoir by comparing all the alternatives in a summary table.

2. Pacoima Reservoir

Similar to his earlier discussion, Dan began his discussion about Pacoima Reservoir by presenting a map that showed the location of Pacoima Reservoir in relation to Pacoima Wash, Little Tujunga Canyon Road, the “Northern” Canyon, the “Southern” Canyon, the U.S. Army Corps’ Lopez Flood Control Basin, and the 210 Freeway. He discussed the six combined sediment management alternatives considered for Pacoima Reservoir – (1) Excavation + Trucks, (2) Excavation + Conveyor [to canyons] + Trucks, (3) Dredge + Slurry Pipeline [to Lopez] + Trucks, (4) Sluice to Lopez + Trucks, (5) Excavation + Conveyor + Canyon Sediment Placement Site, and (6) Dredge + Dewater + Trucks. Dan then compared the six alternatives considered for Pacoima Reservoir by reviewing a summary table.

Upcoming Reservoir Sediment Removal Projects – Brief Update: Keith Lilley

Keith Lilley, Assistant Division Head of Water Resources Division, provided a status update for the Morris, Eaton, Pacoima, Big Tujunga, Cogswell, and Devil's Gate Reservoirs Sediment Removal Projects.

1. Morris and Eaton Reservoirs: These two reservoirs have not had significant inflow of sediment. Therefore, they are not on the fast track; the two reservoirs are being monitored.
2. Pacoima Reservoir: Alternatives for the upcoming Pacoima Reservoir Sediment Removal Project are undergoing a more refined analysis.
3. Big Tujunga Reservoir: A Mitigated Negative Declaration is expected to be released in June. It is expected the project will employ a conveyor or low emission trucks and that good aggregate will be separated from the rest of the sediment and taken out slowly based on need.
4. Cogswell Reservoir: The road to the reservoir is very narrow. Downstream of the reservoir, in the West Fork of the San Gabriel River, there are Santa Ana Suckers. It is expected that in the future, the reservoir will be operated differently.
5. Devil's Gate Reservoir: Analysis of many alternatives and feasibilities is underway. The draft Environmental Impact Report is anticipated to be released in October. Start of the project is expected to be the same.

Wrap-up/Next Steps: Terri Grant

Terri indicated the next Stakeholder Task Force meeting would be in April and that during that meeting, the Strategic Plan's alternatives for all the debris basins and reservoirs would be presented. She said that the Flood Control District would be developing a proposal to work with the aggregate industry and that it would continue to work in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Then Terri thanked the attendees for their participation and adjourned the meeting.

**Sediment Management Strategic Plan
Stakeholder Task Force Meeting # 6 Attendee List**

Agency/Organization	Name	Title
California Native Plant Society / Theodore Payne Foundation	Snowdy Dodson	Board Member
City of Azusa	Carl Hassel	City Engineer
City of Santa Clarita	Kerry Breyer	Senior Engineer
Community Forest Advisory Committee / Theodore Payne Foundation	Lynette Kampe	Executive Director
Council for Watershed Health	Deborah Glaser	Lead Researcher / Policy and Climate
Englander Knabe & Allen (EKA)	Alex Cherin	Vice President
EnviroMINE, Inc.	Crystal Howard	Manager
Friends of Hahamonga	Mary Barrie	
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power	Andy Niknafs	
Neighborhood Unitarian Church	Robin Robinson	
Public	Dave Czamanske	
Public	Kiran Magiawala	
Public	Rody Stephenson	
Public	Wynesta Dale	
San Fernando Valley Audubon Society	Dave Weeshoff	President
Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County	Sam Shammass	Project Engineer
Total Transportation Services, Inc.	Richard Echler	Development Manager
Total Transportation Services, Inc.	Tony Williamson	Director, Business Development & Diversity Services
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Tomas G. Beauchamp	Chief, Operations Branch
U.S. Forest Service - Angeles National Forest	Graham Breakwell	
Vulcan Materials Company	Gary Goellner	Regional Operation Manager
Waste Connections Inc.	Steve Cassulo	Administration
Watershed Conservation Authority	Rob Romanek	Project Manager

[This page has been left blank intentionally]